

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4 – 9 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application in view of the amendments noted is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 9 such that the structure X in claims 1, 8, and 9 is a divalent aromatic compound represented by the structural formula (III-2). This limitation was originally a part of claim 2. Claim 2 has accordingly been cancelled, and claim 3 has also been cancelled in view of the amendment to claim 1 and the cancellation of claim 2.

Claims 1 – 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Mashita et al. (JP-A 2001-305773, HCAPLUS 135:350468; hereinafter “Mashita”) and Nukada et al. (JP-A 8-208820, HCAPLUS 125:342810; hereinafter “Nukada”) (Note, the first named inventor for the JP-A 8-208820 reference is Katsumi Nukada, whereas in the corresponding Chemical Abstracts Plus reference the first inventor is listed as Katsumi Seda). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Among the wide range of compounds taught in the Mashita and Nukada references, neither Mashita nor Nukada disclose a diamine compound having a substructure represented by formula (II-1) wherein X in the formula (II-1) is the divalent aromatic compound represented by the structural formula (III-2). Furthermore, Nukada does not disclose a diamine compound including a condensed aromatic group represented by the structures of formulas (I-1) and (I-2) in claim 1. Moreover, neither Mashita nor Nukada teach or suggest the remarkable effects achieved by the present invention in utilizing the diamine compound having the divalent aromatic compound represented by the structural formula (III-2), such as high mobility and quantum efficiency with excellent practical applicability. Therefore, the present invention is not anticipated or suggested by the cited references. Hence, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and claims 4 – 7, depending directly from claim 1, are also allowable.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 7 over Mashita and Nukada be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mashita or Nukada. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As argued above, neither Mashita nor Nukada teach or suggest a diamine compound as in the present invention wherein the structure X is a divalent aromatic compound represented by the structural formula (III-2). Therefore, the method of making such a diamine compound is not taught or suggested by Mashita or Nukada. Further, Nukada does not teach or suggest a diamine compound including a condensed aromatic group represented by the structures of formulas (I-1) and (I-2) as found in claims 8 and 9, and for this reason Nukada also does not teach or suggest a method of making such a diamine compound.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 8 and 9 over Mashita or Nukada be withdrawn.


This amendment and request for reconsideration is felt to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the examiner and to present the claims in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

A petition for a one-month extension of time and a PTO-2038 authorizing payment of the corresponding fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1) are included herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Mieko Seki et al.

Fildes & Outland, P.C.



Jeremy J. Gajewski, Attorney
Registration No. 52,930
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236
(313) 885-1500